

**Remarks**

The specification stands objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the Examiner is requesting clarification regarding the claimed “transport means” and “heat and pressure application means” terms. The specification has therefore been amended to set forth the components that constitute the transport means and the heat and pressure application means. No new matter is being introduced and this objection is now believed overcome.

After entry of the subject Amendment, claims 1-3 and 5-12 remain pending in the application with claims 1 and 8 being in independent form. Claims 1, 5-6 and 8-9 have been amended and claims 10-12 have been added. Claim 4 is currently being cancelled. Claims 2-3 and 7 are unchanged.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner indicates a number of areas in claims 1 and 8 that lack antecedent basis. These claims, as well as others, have been amended to correct these errors. As such, these rejections are believed overcome.

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,382,553 to Davies et al. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,920,621 to Metzen. Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzen in view of Davis et al.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the prior limitations of dependent claim 4, which related to an upstream fabric speed control means. Independent claim 1 has also been amended to include additional limitations directed to the unique and nonobvious aspects of the subject invention. Similar amendments have been made to independent claim 8.

The rejections based on Davis et al. are believed overcome in light of the amendments to the independent claims. Specifically, as also recognized by the Examiner, Davis et al. does not disclose or teach of an upstream fabric speed control means.

Turning to the rejections based on Metzen and the rejections based on Metzen in view of Davis et al., these rejections are also believed overcome in light of the amendments to the claims. In particular, these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest upstream and downstream fabric control means and heat and pressure application means that are set to achieve a minimum desired fabric shrinkage consistent with a difference in speed between the upstream and downstream fabric control means for stretching any over shrunk fabric back to a desired fabric shrinkage as is required by claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9-12 are also believed to be in condition for allowance as these claims depend from the unique and non-obvious features of claims 1 or 8.

The remaining references cited but not applied to the claims have been considered. Sine the Examiner has apparently considered these references as less pertinent than the above discussed reference(s), further discussion of the non-applied references, at this time, is considered unnecessary. However, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the subject patent application patentably define over all references of record either independently or in combination.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2789 in the name of Howard & Howard Attorneys, P.C. for any fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

**HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.**

**/SAMUEL J. HAIDLE/**

Samuel J. Haidle, Registration No. 42,619

The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101

39400 Woodward Avenue

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151

(248) 645-1483

Dated: November 19, 2007